

Pam  
Addresses

17-

**The Theological Seminary**  
**of**  
**The University of Dubuque**

presents

The Installation Address of

**The Reverend Richard H. Drummond, Ph.D.**

Professor of Ecumenical Mission and History of Religions

entitled

**PROLEGOMENA TO A THEOLOGY**  
**OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD MISSION**



**The Theological Seminary  
of  
The University of Dubuque**

presents

The Installation Address of

**The Reverend Richard H. Drummond, Ph.D.**

Professor of Ecumenical Mission and History of Religions

entitled

**Prolegomena to a Theology of the Christian World Mission**

Westminster Presbyterian Church, Dubuque, Iowa

March 1, 1966

Pretiosae margaritae suae

Dedicat auctor

Hunc libellum

## PROLEGOMENA TO A THEOLOGY OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD MISSION

One of the great facts of the twentieth century is a new awareness of the solidarity of mankind. The concept is of course not a new one. Stoicism regarded mankind as a single family and in the New Testament the perspective of the whole of humanity is always present. The Noachian covenant was intended to comprise the whole of mankind, and the great literary prophets of Israel, at least in eschatological perspective, included the nations within the range of their concern. But the history of Christendom, especially in the post-Constantinian era, does not always manifest a comparable lively awareness of all humanity nor of the implications to faith of that knowledge. As W. A. Visser 't Hooft has observed, it is a strange fact that the Church and its theologians have been slower than humanistic philosophers to recognize and affirm the unity of mankind.<sup>1</sup>

### I.

There is little doubt that the long geographical and cultural isolation of especially Western Europe was an important factor in creating traditions within the Church that have persisted even after the physical isolation had long been broken down. These traditions, however, are not merely expressive of ignorance or narrowness of vision. At least in part they relate to theological issues of profound significance. The God of Christian faith in its classic form has always been regarded as the transcendent Creator of heaven and earth, that is, of the entire cosmos including all men. This relationship is sustained in the belief that the whole of creation is dependent upon its Creator for the maintenance of its existence. But Christian faith also notes and even rejoices in the particularity of events, that God expresses his relationship to the cosmos in a variety of modes and with a hierarchy of values.

This understanding is expressed in the parable of the talents where Jesus, without specifying the reason, implies that there is a diversity in the extent of personal endowments given to men.<sup>2</sup> A distinction in value is expressly assigned when the disciples are said to be of more value than the birds of the air,<sup>3</sup> or than many sparrows.<sup>4</sup> Or "of how much more value is a man than a sheep".<sup>5</sup> This difference in value, however, does not mean absence of fatherly concern, for "not one of them is forgotten before God",<sup>6</sup> and not one of them will fall to the ground without the Father's will.<sup>7</sup> As for the disciples themselves, and presumably for all men, even the very hairs of their head are all numbered.<sup>8</sup>

There is no indication anywhere in the Bible of a divine assignment of essential difference in value among the races or nations of men apart from the possible exception of that difficult passage where the Syrophenician woman the children of Israel are contrasted with the dogs (*κυνάρια*), who are the Gentiles.<sup>9</sup> Some New Testament scholars regard this term as reflective of the prejudice of early Jewish Christians and not from the Lord.<sup>10</sup> But the Christian Church has not hesitated to follow the tradition of the people of Israel in seeing distinctive and particular modes of divine activity in what, by virtue of biblical perspective, we are permitted to call human history.

In accordance with this tradition the Christian Church believes that God has revealed himself in unique fashion through a series of events and persons in the history of the people of Israel. The deliverance of Israel from Egypt and the creation of a covenant people at Mt. Sinai would be primarily significant examples of this revelation. The proclamations of the word of God by later prophets would represent subsequent, and in a sense secondary, examples. It is of Christian faith, however, to see a culmination of this special course of divine revelation in Israel in the man Jesus of Nazareth. This Man is believed to be in a true though rationally inexplicable way the unique manifestation of God himself in human history. Indeed, in him God's self-disclosure and saving activity are seen to attain a supreme and normative focus. Yet, like all other instruments of divine revelation in the history of Israel, Jesus was a human being belonging to a particular time and place and cultural situation.

Furthermore, Christian faith believes that this Man, Jesus the Christ, has created a community of those who are committed to God and his purposes through commitment to the person of the Christ. Through the Holy Spirit the risen Jesus continues to be present as Savior and Lord in this community, which thereby participates in a new order of cosmic existence, properly a reconciled and reconciling community, an eschatological community, representative of the accomplishment of the final purposes of the Creator. To this community has been entrusted the commission of proclamation and service, proclamation of the Gospel or good news of divine reconciliation, and service of mankind in conformity with the final purposes as well as the spirit of reconciliation. In this context the members of the community believe themselves to have access to divine Truth and Power in a way not otherwise available to mankind.

This kind of rigorous particularity is of the essence of the Hebraic and of Christian faith. It has been, however, a recurrent temptation both for Israel and for the Christian Church to believe that a particular divine manifestation is the sole manifestation, or worse, that special gifts to men imply, not special assignments, but reserved privileges and destinies. Not only Israel but also Christendom, especially in its post-Constantinian forms, has yielded to this temptation, the sin of which has been compounded by its expression in formal theological statements as well as in popular piety.

The temptation has been, therefore, to believe that the particular saving activity of God in the history of the people of Israel constitutes the totality of his action among mankind, or that his revelation to Israel is the sole and exhaustive expression of his self-disclosure to humanity. Furthermore, among Protestant Christians the biblical word, "there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved,"<sup>12</sup> has been taken to mean that the eternal salvation of all men depends in the most unqualified and unreserved way upon their acceptance of the empirical proclamation of the Gospel by, preferably Protestant evangelical, Christians.

The corollary of this conviction is that those who lived in times or places unreached by the agents of this empirical proclamation are beyond the reach of the Almighty and are therefore eternally doomed. This once very widespread view in Western Christendom is now held in its rigorous form perhaps by very few in the historic churches.<sup>13</sup> We introduce it at this point not be-

cause it is still held by some Christians but because, while it has ceased to be seriously believed by most, it has not been replaced, at least in the bulk of Protestantism, by a biblically or theologically adequate alternative. Furthermore, a clarification of this issue seems necessary for the "purification of our motives to mission", a purification we deem imperative at the present time. For this reason it will be helpful if at this point we consider an important representative of the rigorous view, J. Hudson Taylor.

## II.

It is difficult for men of this generation to realize how large the figure of J. Hudson Taylor loomed in the Protestant missionary enterprise of the late nineteenth century. Unknown and without the support of any denomination, Taylor founded in 1865 what came to be for a time the largest missionary society in the world, the China Inland Mission. A man of singular sensitivity and charm, Taylor pioneered in a number of important developments. He opened his mission to men and women of little formal education, some of whom became notable scholars and sinologists. Missionaries of the society were to wear Chinese dress and as far as possible identify themselves with the Chinese people. Even the direction of the mission would be in China, not in England.<sup>14</sup> With imagination and courage Taylor conceived a plan whereby for the first time the Christian Gospel, under Protestant auspices, might be carried to the major cities and towns of inland China. In spite of great difficulties and obstacles the project was remarkably successful from the start.

If we should inquire what were primary elements in the motivation of this great pioneer missionary, it would be quite untrue to say that he was not sincerely motivated by love for people as persons. Johannes Warneck in describing Taylor's personality stressed his heartfelt compassion and child-like humility as much as his marvelous organizing ability and astonishing influence with men.<sup>15</sup> But apparently one source of Taylor's singular drive and force lay in the appalling thought or fear of the eternal damnation of the uncounted numbers in China and elsewhere who would perish everlastingly unless they were reached with the message of the Savior by Taylor or other Protestants of similar persuasion. In his first important public address at the great Christian conference in Perth, Scotland, in 1865, Taylor turned directly to this theme, which never left him as a primary motivating principle. He spoke of "the millions whom we leave to perish and that eternally".<sup>16</sup> In China men were living and dying without God and without hope, a million in that one land every month passing beyond our reach.

With quiet yet heartfelt conviction Taylor pressed upon his hearers the claims of those men, women and children for whose salvation an infinite price had been paid and amongst whom no voice was raised to tell of salvation through the finished work of Christ. And how can we be indifferent, he asked, since we believe that "the wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God."<sup>17</sup> He laid upon his hearers their own awesome responsibility to meet this need.

With Taylor himself this consciousness was ever present of perishing souls in China, dying without God—a thousand every hour of the day and night.<sup>18</sup> Taylor was no hypocrite and the burden of these thoughts became such that in his early life he suffered a serious physical breakdown that com-

pelled him to leave China and remain in England for six years. The fact that he was able to achieve the great works of his later life without substantially altering these views is due no doubt to the sublime quality of his faith, without which, as my wife once observed, his theology would have driven him mad.

Taylor's view of the spiritual situation of the unnumbered souls who lived and died in Asia, Africa and the islands of the sea before the accredited emissaries came is illustrated by the following story. Taylor recounted at Perth how a Chinese convert, full of joy in his new-found Christian faith, had asked Taylor:

"How long have you known this Good News in your country?"

"We have know it a long time," was the reluctant answer, "hundreds of years."

"Hundreds of years," exclaimed the ex-Buddhist leader, "and you never came to tell us!"

"My father sought the truth," he added sadly, "sought it long, and died without finding it. Oh, why did you not come sooner?"

Taylor's only answer was the excuse, "Shall we say that the way was not open." But with characteristic practicality he pressed the point home to his hearers at Perth, "At any rate it is open now. Before the next Perth Conference twelve millions more, in China, will have passed forever beyond our reach."<sup>19</sup>

The Chinese convert in this story apparently accepted the horrendous theological implications of Taylor's interpretation with only a querulous demurrer. Christians in the lands outside the Western world have generally handled the problem by simply reserving judgment, an attitude, as we shall see, wiser than at first appears. But we shall perhaps never know the extent of the harm wrought among those for whom the view became a major stumbling block to Christian faith. It is noted that one of the strongest objections of Japanese to the Jesuit theology proclaimed in the sixteenth century was that "it unjustly condemned their ancestors to hell for the crime of not being previously exposed to Christianity."<sup>20</sup>

### III.

The profound sincerity of Hudson Taylor gave a singularly clear and luminous expression to his convictions, but it is important to recognize that they bring to a focus the views not only of Pietist-revivalism but also at least the implications of older Protestant orthodoxy. The Apology of the Augsburg Confession expresses the general belief of the Reformers that the Gospel had been disseminated over the entire world by the apostles and therefore the nations are without excuse in their present unbelief.<sup>21</sup> Luther wrote in his Large Catechism that the true honor and service of God, which he sharply distinguished from the false worship and idolatry of the heathen, is commanded under penalty of eternal wrath.<sup>22</sup> Calvin, on the basis that the name of the one God was everywhere known, concludes that "the heathen, to a man, by their own vanity either were dragged or slipped back into false inventions" and were thus inexcusable.<sup>23</sup>

This position, however, is a direct inheritance from Medieval Catholicism in the West. The Fourth Lateran Council in A. D. 1215 adopted verbatim the formula of Cyprian that outside the Church there is no salvation (Extra



ecclesiam nulla salus), although, we should note, in the age of Cyprian himself the church of Rome opposed Cyprian and the rigorous North Africa tradition on this point of exclusiveness.<sup>24</sup> Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) accepted without reservation the belief that outside the formal structure of the Roman church and its sacraments there is no salvation.<sup>25</sup> The Council of Ferrara and Florence (1438-39) made this position even more explicit by the declaration that "all pagans, Jews, heretics and schismatics have forfeited eternal life and are destined to everlasting fire."<sup>26</sup>

We shall have occasion later to note that this last position is no longer that of the Roman Catholic Church, particularly as seen in the Declaration of the Second Vatican Council on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions. Yet it largely informed the great apostle to the Indies, Francis Xavier, who believed, with Augustine, that unbaptized persons necessarily went to hell.<sup>27</sup> The Protestant Reformers held essentially the same views, but for reasons, some by no means adequate, which we cannot enter into here, they excused themselves from following out the missionary implications of their theology.

What created a new situation in the Protestant churches was the great movement which we have designated Pietist-revivalism, a term of which the first part was more widely used on the continent of Europe, the second in English-speaking lands. An important consequence of this great movement was that unbelief was taken seriously in a new and explicit way. If faith in God through Jesus Christ was understood to be the sole means of salvation, than unbelief must necessarily entail damnation. The greater part of the movement conceived of damnation as a separation from God in hell for all eternity. In the tension between the certainty of their own salvation and the contemplation of the horrendous fate of those without Christ, these men were led into a new consciousness of the peoples of Asia, Africa and the islands of the sea.<sup>28</sup> Amidst the variety of motives that have worked to bring about the great modern missionary movement, we can confidently affirm that concern for the eternal welfare of otherwise doomed men was of major significance.<sup>29</sup>

This view, as we have seen, no longer characterizes the bulk of the Christian world, although most of us would feel that we are still in the midst of a process of transition. In the Declaration of Vatican Council II on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions the statement is made that the providence of God, manifestations of his goodness, and his saving design extend to all men. There is a very sympathetic account of the spiritual intent and religious methodology of men in Hinduism and Buddhism. The statement is also made that "The Catholic Church rejects nothing that is true and holy in these religions. She regards with sincere reverence those ways of conduct and of life, those precepts and teachings which, though differing in many aspects from the one she holds and sets forth, nonetheless often reflect a ray of that Truth which enlightens all men."<sup>30</sup> Even stronger affirmations are made with regard to Islam and Judaism.

An emerging position in Protestantism is seen in the New Delhi report of the World Council of Churches. Here we note the belief that before we speak to our brother man of Christ, Christ has already sought him.<sup>31</sup> The Holy Spirit leads men to where Christ already is. The Holy Spirit is also seen as ceaselessly working among men, and Christian witness is properly to

the whole activity of God in the world.<sup>32</sup> The report also speaks of the wisdom, love and power which God has given to men of other faiths and no faith. Significance is seen in the fact that other faiths are not merely being displaced but are being changed by their encounter with Christianity.<sup>33</sup> Contrary to the Pietist-revivalist tendency to prejudge the eternal destinies of men, the report affirms, "Because God in Christ has reconciled the world to himself we may no longer judge our brother man by ordinarily accepted standards. God has not condemned us; we may not condemn any man."<sup>34</sup>

We are admittedly dealing with difficult problems here. This new position does not mean an approval of non-Christian religions *per se*; we dare not make such approval of empirical Christianity. Nor do we proclaim that all religions are at bottom the same and merely represent different roads to the same goal. But, if, as the United Presbyterian "Proposed Confession of 1967" states, "the Christian finds many parallels between other religions and his own and must approach all religions with openness and respect,"<sup>35</sup> the question must be asked, wherein does the Church find its reason and motivation to carry the Gospel to all men? In this context what is the significance of conversion? We shall attempt to consider these problems briefly in our conclusion, but because of the grave misunderstandings that we have described as operative over a long segment of Christian history, it is imperative that we consider first the problem of biblical views of the nations and of the judgments of God related to them.

#### IV.

Contemporary Old Testament scholarship has shown that the covenantal relationship of Israel to Yahweh its God was central to the self-awareness of the people of Israel. This covenant, carrying the force of a contractual relationship with reciprocal responsibilities, was of course not one as between equals.<sup>36</sup> It depended on the gracious initiative of Yahweh particularly as that was manifested in the deliverance of the people of Israel from Egypt and in the revelation basic to the creation of the covenant at Mt. Sinai. Furthermore, the deliverance from Egypt is seen in our chief historical sources as the fulfilment of God's earlier promises to the patriarchs. Both the Exodus and the conquest of the land were viewed as a witness to Yahweh's faithfulness to his promises.<sup>37</sup> Hence what we may call the theology of Israel was rooted in this faith-understanding of the gracious initiative and dependable faithfulness of Yahweh.

The history of Israel is seen in the biblical record as primarily the history of her response, with varying degrees of faithfulness and unfaithfulness, to a covenantal relationship which, on Yahweh's side, was preserved with unswerving fidelity.<sup>38</sup> As to what constituted unfaithfulness on Israel's part, we find graphic expression particularly in the literary prophets. Since the will of Yahweh is for his people to show mercy, especially to the widow, the orphan, the poor and the stranger at the gate, oppression of the poor by the rich or any other form of social or economic injustice is seen as specifically representing breach of the covenant.<sup>39</sup>

What we now call personal morality was also the object of prophetic concern. The indignation of the Hebrew prophets against the worship of Baal did not arise primarily from the foreignness of his name but in no small part from the fact that burning of children and the use of cult prostitutes were

integral parts of his worship.<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, the strong and consistent concern of Hebrew prophecy for social justice did not divert its great representatives from an equal concern for the inner intent and motives of men. Joel, who cried out, "Rend your hearts and not your garments",<sup>41</sup> was but one of the many who proclaimed that Yahweh desires worship that is sincere and manifests its sincerity in appropriate deeds.

The relationship implied in the covenant was personal because Yahweh is personal. For this reason adultery seemed the word best fitted to denote breach of the covenant. The breaking of the most intimate of inter-human relationships was seen to be the most apt metaphor to describe Israel's unfaithfulness to her Lord.<sup>42</sup>

Perhaps the most dramatic expression in the Old Testament of the issue of loyalty or disloyalty to Yahweh is that given in the description of the contest of Elijah with the prophets of Baal on Mt. Carmel.<sup>43</sup> We have already noted the fact that from the standpoint of Hebraic prophetic tradition the most elemental questions of personal and social morality were involved in this contest. But wider problems were also entailed. The worship of Baal meant to take on a world view, with a corresponding system of thought and practice, wherein no fundamental distinction was made between the divine and the natural. In this pattern of cosmic totality unqualified religious sanction could be given to royal authority and social structures in their empirical manifestations. The ethical consequence was that no transcendent criterion existed from which one could criticize political or social injustice if perpetrated by the ruling powers of state or society. Yet it is significant that on this occasion Elijah did not reprove the Canaanites; he addressed himself to the people of Israel. They were the ones who had the primary responsibility, and they were called to be loyal to what they knew.<sup>44</sup>

The prophetic address to Israel is consistently that of an appeal to a relationship and an obligation already in existence, to a knowledge already possessed.<sup>45</sup> The prophets of Israel were primarily preachers and reformers, not religious innovators.<sup>46</sup> The Word of God is primarily addressed to a people, not about them. And, as we shall see, when the judgment of God is proclaimed against particular foreign nations, it is not because of the nature of their religious faith but for their evil deeds, which represent faithlessness to an obligation or knowledge already known.<sup>47</sup>

This is not to say that the prophets in general gave approval to or saw divine significance in the religious beliefs and practices of the nations. In Malachi we do find the surprising suggestion that Yahweh is worshiped throughout the world under the guise of every man's worship, "For from the rising of the sun to its setting my name is great among the nations, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure offering; for my name is great among the nations, says the Lord of hosts."<sup>48</sup> This verse has been described as a sport, untypical of the Old Testament. There have been those who contend that the ferocity of Deuteronomy 7.2,5 is more representative of biblical thought. Actually there is in general a more discriminating attitude in the Old Testament.<sup>49</sup> Idols are regarded as nothing, as empty wind, as a delusion.<sup>50</sup> The gods of the nations (*ēl*), however, are recognized as at least contingent realities, representing the powers of nature. Thus in Deut. 10.17 Yahweh is called God of gods. We must not, to be sure, exaggerate the "liberalism" of Malachi, but the Old Testament like the New contains

more than one theological position, and this product (i.e. Malachi) of the tolerant atmosphere of the Persian Empire, itself representative of a high religious faith, without question gives the most generous estimate of non-Israelite religion to be found in the Old Testament.<sup>51</sup>

There are, however, other important items of evidence to be considered. G. Ernest Wright has argued in a recent article that the so-called "woes" pronounced upon the nations<sup>52</sup> represent not imprecations but laments,<sup>53</sup> or more often, statements declarative of Yahweh's ethical judgments. Furthermore, the term **neqamah** translated by the RSV as "vengeance" in Jeremiah 46.10 and 51.11 is more properly rendered "vindication" as of the prerogatives of Yahweh in the world. The context is, Wright contends, a conception of the **imperium** or universal suzerainty of Yahweh over the world wherein "the peoples and nations of the world are bound together in various ways by law." The prophetic declarations relate to specific transgressions of that law. Wright, following Frank M. Cross, Jr., makes the further suggestion that the covenant of brotherhood mentioned in Amos 1.9 refers to the system of vassal and purity treaties created in the empire of David and still held by the prophets to have binding moral force in some sense even after the dissolution of the Davidic empire. Similar relationships were reconstructed by the legal arrangements subsisting in the Assyrian and Babylonian empires. Thus the pronouncements of the prophets on the nations would have been made in the context of a mutually known law or structure of agreements.<sup>54</sup> In any case, the principle is that of ethical judgment on the basis of known law and responsibility.

In Malachi there are to be found strong words expressive of God's hatred of Edom. Yet this was not because Edom was a heathen nation, but because the people were cruel and treacherous.<sup>55</sup> In the great day of the Lord's action the primary characteristic of God's people will be once more to "distinguish between the righteous and the wicked, between one who serves God and one who does not serve Him."<sup>56</sup> This is a distinction based primarily upon ethical conduct.<sup>57</sup> Men and nations are to be judged by their ethical performance, in accordance with their knowledge.<sup>58</sup> Israel has unique knowledge of Yahweh and his will.<sup>59</sup> But this high knowledge carries high responsibility. Thus Amos proclaims the Lord as saying, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; **therefore** I will punish you for all your iniquities."<sup>60</sup>

But the nations are not, according to the Old Testament, unrelated to Yahweh, neither are they without a form of covenant. We must acknowledge that neither the Old nor New Testament reveals a deliberately worked out theory on this problem, but it is clear that Israel, at least from the beginning of the period of the literary prophets, regarded Yahweh as Creator and Lord of the universe, and therefore as Lord of the nations as well as of Israel. They are a part of his creation.<sup>61</sup> In the covenant with Noah Yahweh established a covenant "with mankind as a whole and with every living creature."<sup>62</sup> The covenant with Abraham must be understood as subsisting within this larger framework, and, indeed, its narrower scope exists only for a universal, restorative purpose, that "by you all the families of the earth will bless themselves".<sup>63</sup>

It is for this reason that Amos can proclaim Yahweh as saying, "Are you not like the Ethiopians to me, O people of Irsael?" says the Lord. "Did

I not bring up Israel from the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir?"<sup>64</sup> Second Isaiah in a famous passage describes Cyrus, the Persian king who permitted the Jewish exiles to return to their homeland, as the anointed of the Lord, as one called by name to do the service of the Lord, "though you do not know me."<sup>65</sup> For the prophet, Yahweh is the Lord; and there is no other, beside him there is no God.<sup>66</sup> The theological perspective of the prophet therefore leaves him no alternative but to include the liberating work of Cyrus within the providence of Yahweh. Habakkuk sees the punitive role of the Chaldeans as directly expressive of the plan and work of God.<sup>67</sup> Jeremiah describes Nebuchadnezzar as the servant of Yahweh to fulfill his judgments.<sup>68</sup>

In the Wisdom books of the Old Testament there is to be found a recognition of the value of the wisdom of the nations. It is likely that Agur, son of Jakeh of Massa in Proverbs 30.1 represents a non-Hebrew figure. The verse is linguistically difficult and the Septuagint does not translate the words as denoting names of persons. But Agur and Jakeh are not Hebrew names. They may be connected with Arabic roots, and Massa may refer to the Arabian tribe of Massa, east of Palestine.<sup>69</sup> In 1 Kings 4.30-31, however, we read, "Solomon's wisdom surpassed the wisdom of all the people of the east and all the wisdom of Egypt. For he was wiser than all other men, wiser than Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, Calcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol." In this passage at least three sources of wisdom existing outside Israel are mentioned: Egypt, the Arabs of the East, and Edom, for the sons of Mahol were Edomites sages. The wisdom of Edom is referred to also in Jer. 49.7 and Obad. 8. Job and his friends were of non-Israelite origin, most of them coming from Edom. It is now widely acknowledged that the Hebrews were familiar with the wisdom literatures of Babylonia, Syria, Edom, Arabia and Egypt and that they borrowed quite extensively from them.<sup>70</sup>

It is possible to find in the universal perspectives of the Old Testament a valid basis for missionary witness.<sup>71</sup> It was not, however, until the inter-testamental period, in the Jewish Diaspora, that the missionary implications were drawn to the extent of substantial practical implementation.<sup>72</sup> In a sense anticipatory of this development, there is, however, one book in the Hebrew Old Testament which dramatically contrasts narrow, nationalistic self-concern with the missionary responsibility that properly belonged to Israel's faith. That book is Jonah. Here we see a prophet called to preach repentance to a foreign people in spite of their cruel treatment of Israel, because Yahweh cares for them, because he has personal concern for the welfare of the people of Ninevah, even for their cattle.<sup>73</sup> The prophet addresses himself to the ethical issues and urges everyone in Nineveh to "turn from his evil way and from the violence which is in his hands."<sup>74</sup> But the unique message of the book is that the Lord who delivers, who is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love, is also so disposed toward the nations, and the prophet (Israel) has been called to minister to that purpose. This is primarily the reason for the prophet's anguish of spirit, and presumably, in the author's mind, of the people of Israel.

The consequence of the above is to understand that the election of Israel was for service, not for privilege.<sup>75</sup> And if the servant should fail in his mission, it does not mean that the Lord is utterly frustrated in his design or

that the nations are thereby abandoned. Furthermore, whatever the extent that Yahweh will use Israel to fulfill his saving purposes toward mankind, the prophetic eschatological perspective sees Israel as subject to judgment together with the nations. Th. C. Vriezen writes in this connection that the election of Israel is not to be identified with certainty of salvation. Rather, "the Old Testament is not concerned in the first instance to lay the foundations of a certainty of salvation, but to place the fact of (Israel's) existence as the people of God in the right light: this privilege has not been extended to Israel that she might become infatuated by it, but that she might recognize it as a commission."<sup>76</sup>

We are reminded in this context of Paul's words to the church in Corinth, "I pommel my body and subdue it, lest after preaching to others I myself should be disqualified."<sup>77</sup> We are thus led to the conclusion that the biblical concept of election, or of the people of God, means election for responsible service. It is properly at the opposite pole from notions of favoritism or personal privilege. There are of course many positive meanings to the term election, meanings that issue from assurance of God and of his acceptance. But they do not, as we see, allow us to think of a guaranteed salvation. Furthermore, the hope, even the assurance in faith, of the personal or corporate salvation of God's people does not grant the right to predetermine the ultimate destinies of the nations. And if we see the focus of God's activity for the redemption of mankind to lie within the history of his chosen people, this does not mean that his activity or his concern are confined to that people. With this as our theme, let us turn now to consider the New Testament views of our problem.

## V.

The continuity which we properly stress as obtaining between the Old and New Testaments does not preclude the emergence of something distinctly new. As Johannes Blauw has written, "the expectations are not only exceeded but also overtaken, modified, corrected."<sup>78</sup> The centripetal perspective of the Old Testament becomes centrifugal, so that Jerusalem is more a point of departure rather than of return. The mobile missionary congregation becomes the base of action rather than the Temple. The resurrection of the Messiah has demonstrated his Lordship, and a new eschatological perspective has been revealed. This coming of Jesus does not mean the absolute end; it ushers in a new aeon or period of time in the history of Israel and of the world,<sup>79</sup> the primary significance of which derives from the presence and purpose of the Spirit of Jesus in their midst.

The Lordship of Christ, however, which represents the Kingdom of God in proleptic form, always points in both concern and commission to the world of the nations. The mission of the Church is a natural consequence of this perspective. But the Church is the servant of its Lord, and through him servant of the world. It is not master of the world nor in control of its ultimate destiny; the office of the keys can never mean this. The Church is therefore not competent to pass final judgment upon the world. Arthur C. Cochrane has expressed this point very aptly in discussing the role of a church confession, "a confession does not make an absolute and eternal division among men. **For the time being** it makes a separation between the true and

the false church, between believers and unbelievers (or heretical believers). But it never makes a separation between the elect and the reprobate, the saved and the damned.”<sup>80</sup>

In Jesus’ parable of the wicked husbandmen we find affirmation of continuity with the old aeon and acknowledgment of the divine presence in the role of the prophets of Israel.<sup>81</sup> It is God who sent the succession of servant-messengers to Israel. A unique element, however, is introduced in the sending of the (beloved) son, mentioned in all three synoptic gospels.<sup>82</sup> The function of both servants and son is the same; all are messengers of the same owner on the same errand. The difference lies in the unique relationship to the owner of the son; he is both son and heir. This parable constitutes a forthright affirmation of the activity of God in the history of Israel, and of his manifestation in a new and supreme mode in the present.<sup>83</sup>

In the synoptic gospels most references to the activity of God outside the bounds of Israel relate that activity in some way to Israel. Thus it was Elijah who was sent to a widow of Zarephath in Sidon.<sup>84</sup> It was Elisha who cleansed Naaman the Syrian general.<sup>85</sup> It is, however, worthy of note that in Luke these incidents are cited particularly to show God’s concern for those outside Israel. The worshipers of God whom we meet in the pages of the Acts of the Apostles as adherents of the Jewish synagogues of the Diaspora are also related to historic Israel,<sup>86</sup> as is the incident described in Mark 7.24-30 of Jesus’ meeting a Greek-speaking Syrophenician woman and healing her daughter.

The story of the healing of the centurion’s slave recorded in Matthew and Luke is properly to be included within the same category.<sup>87</sup> In Matthew’s version, however, an addition is made which suggests that a relationship with Israel may not be indispensable. Jesus is recorded as saying, “I tell you, many will come from east and west and sit at the table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, while the sons of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness.”<sup>88</sup> The same thought is expressed in a different context in Luke 13.28-29.

In Luke 12.47-48, however, we find the clearest exposition of the prophetic conviction that the judgments of God relate primarily to the ethical quality of men’s deeds and that higher knowledge brings higher responsibility. After relating the parable of the faithful and unfaithful servants, Luke appends the saying of Jesus, “And that servant who knew his master’s will, but did not make ready or act according to his will, shall receive a severe beating. But he who did not know, and did what deserved a beating, shall receive a light beating.”<sup>89</sup> In the perspective of our study it is only reasonable to interpret this saying as revealing the divine mode of judgment, not only of Israel, but of all mankind. These words express what H. J. Cadbury called the principle of proportionate duty,<sup>90</sup> and they are in accord with what we have seen also as characterizing the main prophetic tradition of Israel.

In John 9.41 we find this principle expressed in Jesus’ words to certain Pharisees, “If you were blind, you would have no guilt; but now that you say, ‘We see,’ your guilt remains.”<sup>91</sup> In this context mention should also be made of the parable of the sheep and the goats in Matthew 25.31-46. Separation of the sheep from the goats is not made on the basis of ethnic or cultural affiliation or even of religious faith, but as a consequence of the presence or

lack of ethical, in particular of compassionate conduct. It is significant also that this parable of the Last Judgment expressly includes "all the nations" within its concern.<sup>92</sup> The repeated references in the gospels to the fact that the last will be first and the first last suggest that popular views of the divine judgment will be reversed.<sup>93</sup>

We must be very clear, however, that this profound biblical concern for just judgment does not mean a blurring of qualitative distinctions or imply a blanket approval of the religious faiths and practices of the nations. To the contrary, the few references we have recorded as from Jesus himself suggest that he had a low opinion of surrounding gentile religious mores. In Matthew he describes the Gentiles as masking their ignorance with verbose prayers,<sup>94</sup> as being overly concerned for their physical needs,<sup>95</sup> and delivery into the hands of the Gentiles is seen as the natural climax to the tragic fate of the Messiah.<sup>96</sup> But this evaluation does not lead to an assumption of summary divine judgment. Rather, we note in Luke that when Jesus was refused entrance to a Samaritan village and his disciples asked if they should bid fire to come down from heaven to punish the villagers, Jesus rebuked the disciples.<sup>97</sup>

The verse in Luke immediately following the reference to severe and light beatings seems to constitute a kind of summation of Jesus' mind on this problem. "Everyone to whom much is given, of him will much be required; and of him to whom men commit much they will demand the more."<sup>98</sup> These words assume quantitative if not qualitative variations in the givenness of life. They indicate at least a proportionate responsibility from the more highly privileged. But from the distinction between the **much** and the **more** there is also a suggestion that in the realm of moral responsibility there is something akin to the principle of the modern graduated income tax. The higher the privilege, the more steeply rises the responsibility, not by arithmetical but by geometrical progression.

We are not granted to know the reasons for differences in the givenness. We even have the paradoxical statement that "For to him who has will more be given, and he will have abundance; but from him who has not, even what he has will be taken away."<sup>99</sup> Perhaps the meaning of this verse is that all men must attend to their responsibility, and smallness of endowment is no excuse for lethargy or despair. But Jesus appears to have devoted attention not only to the exploited or underprivileged of Israel but, as H. J. Cadbury has pointed out, many of his remarks were addressed to favored persons<sup>100</sup> The rich are shamed by the relative generosity of the poor widow's offering,<sup>101</sup> Simon the Pharisee is shamed by the costly offering and tender care of the sinful woman,<sup>102</sup> the priest and Levites are outdone by a foreign Samaritan.<sup>103</sup> The Jews in spite of their privileges will be cast out while men will come from east and west, and from north and south, and sit at table in the kingdom of God.<sup>104</sup>

The point is that not just a proportioned more, but **even** more will be expected of the favored. Jesus expects his disciples to exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees.<sup>105</sup> He proclaims the special privileges of his generation and asserts that their less favored predecessors, even the wicked of Sodom, Tyre and Sidon, will find it more tolerable in the day of judgment than those who reject what greater thing God has offered them now.<sup>106</sup> The



beatitudes and woes pronounced by Jesus are properly to be interpreted in this context. The rich have not acted in proportion to their advantages while "the poor have often deserved better than might have been expected of them." In the same way the Jew is contrasted with Samaritan or Gentile. Thus we may say that the principle running throughout Jesus' teaching is more than a proportionate responsibility. It is the call to an excess, a surplus, an uncalculating generosity of spirit and conduct.<sup>107</sup>

In Acts 4.12 we note as a part of Peter's statement before the Jewish Sanhedrin the verse which we have quoted above, "And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved." To be understood properly this statement must be seen in its context. For one thing, the term salvation (σώζω, σωτηρία) has a variety of meaning in the New Testament. Only about one-fifth of the 150 instances in the New Testament of the use of the words "save" and "salvation" refer to a salvation to be consummated at the last day. Nearly a third refer to deliverance from specific ills, as in Acts 4.10 just preceding our present verse.<sup>108</sup> But in particular, this same Peter is recorded in Acts 10.34-35 as saying in the house of Cornelius, the Roman centurion, "Truly I perceive that God shows no partiality, but in every nation any one who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him."<sup>109</sup> Similarly in Acts 14.17 we see Barnabas and Paul at Lystra proclaiming the living God who "did not leave himself without witness (among the nations), for he did good and gave you from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, satisfying your hearts with food and gladness."

A like reference to the bountiful providence of God is found in what is reported to be Paul's message to the Athenians on the Areopagus, providence which had the specific intent that the nations "should seek after God, in the hope that they might feel after him and find him."<sup>110</sup> This message is no stenographic report; it is rather in the tradition of Greek historiography, following Thucydides, by which the historian himself composes the text of speeches on the basis of the known tenor and circumstances of the occasion. It does, however, at least reflect what Luke thought was said or should have been said on the occasion. Thus there is considerable significance in Paul's being recorded as quoting a phrase which is generally attributed to the Greek poet Aratus,<sup>111</sup> the only such instance in the New Testament. The Dutch scholar C. J. Bleeker sees this quotation as indicating Paul's acknowledgment of the significance of Greek culture. Bleeker also contends that the statement in verse 22, "Men of Athens, I perceive that in every way you are very religious" is a declaration of Paul's "respect for other religions and an acknowledgment of the quality of their truth."<sup>112</sup>

In the absence of other confirmatory evidence, this is probably to go too far, particularly as Paul says in effect that the main burden of his message is unknown to the Athenians.<sup>113</sup> Nevertheless, the spirit of the entire passage is respectful and appreciative, one which seeks for points of spiritual and intellectual contact.

In 1 Cor. 8.4 Paul states emphatically that "we know that 'an idol has no real existence,' and that 'there is no God but one.'" He immediately qualifies this, however, in accordance with what we have seen is the dominant

view of the Old Testament, by adding that there are in fact many gods and lords in heaven or on earth. In 1 Cor. 10.20 Paul asserts that the objects of pagan worship are demons or hostile spiritual powers.<sup>114</sup> It is clear that allowance of this kind of secondary existence does not constitute an affirmation of their positive religious significance.<sup>115</sup> Like Jesus, Paul's understanding of the judgments of God does not lead him to any general approval of the empirical state of the religion of the Gentiles.

The *locus classicus* for Paul's treatment of the place of the nations in the economy of God is the first three chapters of Romans. Paul's contention in Romans 1.19-32 is that the fact of God, his nature as eternal power and deity, is knowable to all men through his creation. Paul does not say that this knowledge is attained by the exercise of human reason alone, for "God has shown it to them."<sup>116</sup> That is to say, God's revelatory activity is involved in all true knowledge of him. Paul further contends that God's law or basic moral requirements are written in the consciences of the Gentiles.<sup>117</sup> It would appear from Romans 1.21 ff., as from Isaiah 44.9-2, Jeremiah 10.3-9, etc., that Paul agreed with historic Israel in regarding this knowledge as in fact gravely corrupted in the nations—and in much of Israel—but still of such quality as to leave man without excuse for his depraved life and worship.

The main thrust of Romans 2, however, is a Pauline exposition of what we have called the principle of proportionate duty. Paul continues to affirm the reality and significance of Israel's election and related advantages. Israel has a unique relationship to God and unique knowledge.<sup>118</sup> But if Israel is unfaithful to God and disobedient to his law, the whole structure of advantage is demolished.<sup>119</sup> For God shows no partiality.<sup>120</sup> Paul in fact expresses with a new clarity what we have seen to be the consistent prophetic emphasis in the Old Testament. The judgments of God are not according to men's ideology but apportioned to their conduct, "for he will render to everyman according to his works."<sup>121</sup> Thus if the Jew is first, he is the first to receive judgment as he is the first to receive praise.<sup>122</sup> The same thought, we may note, is expressed in 1 Peter 4.17 in the statement of the principle that judgment begins with the household of God.

There is much advantage and value, Paul writes, to Israel's participation in the covenant with her God, but "whatever the law says it speaks to those who are under the law."<sup>123</sup> Thus the privileges of the law and oracles of God carry responsibility, but the responsibility of the law lies upon those who are under it and know it. If, as Paul says, the whole world is accountable to God, it will be in terms of its own situation and knowledge, for God is the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews.<sup>124</sup> In this passage Paul is primarily concerned to show that all men have sinned, that the real advantages of the Jew do not alter this fact, and that the remedy to this situation of universal failure lies only in the acceptance through faith of God's gracious act of redemption in Jesus Christ. But Paul is also concerned to make clear that God is not partial, that his judgments are just and fair.

Among the letters that have been traditionally ascribed to Paul, Ephesians contains the most negative language regarding the spiritual situation of the nations apart from Israel. Indeed, the difference from the letters generally held to be authentically Pauline is such as to constitute a further reason for denying the authorship of Ephesians to Paul. The Gentiles are said to

have been "separated from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world."<sup>125</sup> The last phrase in particular finds no correspondence in the demonstrably authentic letters of Paul. In Ephesians 4.17 ff. the Gentiles are further described as living in the futility of their minds, darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God. This ascription to the nations of a total alienation from God is, as we have learned, not characteristic of the central understanding of either the Old or New Testament.

## VI.

We shall conclude our consideration of New Testament views of this subject of the nations and divine judgment with a brief discussion of the Logos doctrines as it is found in the gospel of John. It was this doctrine, particularly as it was developed by the early Greek apologists, that came to express with singular aptness the way in which a large part of the early Church understood the relationship of God to the nations and his work among them.

It would take us too far afield to consider in detail the significance of the term **logos** in pre-Christian Greek thought. The author of John, however, need not have been learned in Stoic, neo-Platonic, neo-Pythagorean, or Philonic literature to be aware of the widespread Hellenistic usage of **logos** to denote universal, divine Reason, generally with pantheistic overtones.<sup>126</sup> He gives, however, new content to the word, for he asserts—what no Hellenistic Greek had done—that the **logos** became flesh.<sup>127</sup> He identifies the **logos** with the man Jesus of Nazareth.<sup>128</sup> He clearly retains, however, the universal, although not the pantheistic, significance of Hellenistic usage. The Greek idea of **logos** was in general based upon a static conception of reality to be distinguished from the dynamism inherent in the Hebraic views of divine acting and speaking.<sup>129</sup> But it is a universal divine acting and speaking that John evidently wishes to denote, for he describes the **logos** as "the true light that enlightens every man."<sup>130</sup>

Rudolph Bultmann contends that the **logos** of the prologue of John is not used to explain the relation of the transcendent God to the world. Bultmann's basis for this contention is his view that in John the term comes not from the philosophical but from the mythological tradition and is not used to serve a cosmological interest.<sup>131</sup> He uses the adjective mythological to denote the tradition of cosmological mythology expressed, for example, in the Wisdom figure of later Judaism and especially in Philo.<sup>132</sup> Bultmann's position, however, can hardly be maintained, as the author of John expressly establishes a relation between God and the world by his description of the role of the divine Logos in creation, "all things were made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made."<sup>133</sup> For John, however, the world in its present state is existence in bondage, and in the apparently dualistic dichotomy between light and darkness the world is darkness. This darkness is not, as Bultmann rightly observes, merely a shadow lying upon the world but is its own peculiar nature in which it is at ease and at home.<sup>134</sup> Yet the world is the creation of God, and its being in darkness, death and falsehood is not the consequence of a metaphysical dualism but of a wilful turning away from the light. "Men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."<sup>135</sup>

John, then, like Paul, sees divine judgment as indiscerptibly associated with ethical conduct.<sup>136</sup> Furthermore, following the same prophetic tradition, he makes no ultimate distinction between Jew and Gentile, both belong to the world, the world which God nevertheless loves.<sup>137</sup> Both are in the power of darkness,<sup>138</sup> and to both the light has come, for the true light enlightens every man, not only in the incarnation of the Logos, but by clear and necessary implication, through other modes as well.<sup>139</sup> And from both shall come the true worshipers of God.<sup>140</sup>

We see therefore that the prophetic tradition in both the Old and New Testaments is one in seeing the nations and Israel to be equally the creation of God, equally the object of his love and concern. Appreciable and purposeful differences, however, are held to obtain in the mode and degree of divine revelation to men. The people of Israel and then the people of God in the new aeon, the Christian Church, are believed to participate in a unique covenantal relationship with their God and thereby to be special instruments for the fulfilment of his purposes. Yet there is an ancient divine covenant with all men. All men have some light, and the judgments of the Eternal are proportioned to the degree or quality of the light men have received and to the ethical quality of their response.

The mission of the Church as the new people of God is a service of God, to proclaim to the nations his reconciliation and redemption wrought in Jesus Christ and to teach what has been given of his divine will and purpose. This service is furthermore believed to be an instrument in the plan of God unto the transformation of man and the entire cosmos. But it does not mean that the judgments of God in the meantime fall lightly upon the people of God and heavily upon the nations. Rather, we read, "For judgment I came into this world, that those who do not see may see, and that those who see may become blind."<sup>141</sup> Judgment has not been committed to the Church, but to the Lord of the Church.<sup>142</sup> The people of God serve him in gladness and hope, knowing already something of the power of his salvation, but they dare not presume to prejudget the final results, in themselves or in others.

## VII.

We shall now consider very briefly the main lines of the development of the thought of the Church on our subject. The general and persistent stance of the early Church toward the religious worship and practice of Hellenistic paganism, particularly in its popular manifestations, was highly critical.<sup>143</sup> Lactantius wrote about A. D. 313 that the first step in Christian proclamation is "to perceive the religions which are false, and to cast aside the impious worship of gods made by human hands."<sup>144</sup> Origen, writing against Celsus circ. 250, describes standard instruction of catechumens as including the effort to instill a disregard for idols and all images.<sup>145</sup>

The relationship of the Church, however, to Hellenistic culture as a whole and to its religio-philosophic thought in particular was much more complex than might be inferred from these two quotations. The writings of Lactantius, and even more of Origen, are themselves a clear indication of this fact. The nature of the Christian Gospel, to be sure, inevitably led it into direct conflict with certain elements of Hellenistic culture. A perusal, for instance, of the oldest example of prose fiction in classical literature, Petronius'

Satiricon, reveals clearly why the Church had to wage moral and spiritual warfare especially against certain popular manifestations. But there were other persons and traditions in that culture besides Trimalchio and his friends. For example, under the influence of especially Stoic philosophy a growing humaneness of spirit is discernible in the second and third centuries of our era, manifesting itself, to give one instance, in legislation aimed at more humane treatment of slaves.<sup>146</sup> The increase, too, in the Church of the number of persons of education and means made it inevitable that more thoughtful evaluation of Hellenistic culture be made from the standpoint of Christian faith. Above all, the mission of the Church led men to seek for wise and winsome ways of communicating the Gospel.

The question came to be asked, does acceptance of Jesus Christ as the supreme and normative revelation of the living God require the complete rejection of the wisdom of this world? Does committal to what Paul called the folly of the cross mean that the cultural heritage of Hellenism has no value or truth and must be summarily rejected?<sup>147</sup> Or was pagan culture and learning in some way, at least in part, in accord with the wisdom and purposes of God and to be claimed by those who have unreservedly committed themselves to God in the person of the Christ? Both attitudes were to be found in the Church from the beginning, and both could claim apostolic precedent.<sup>148</sup> Tatian and Tertullian are examples of the school of rejection. Expressive of this position is Tertullian's famous question, **Quid Athenis et Hierosolymis? Quid academiae et ecclesiae** (What is there in common between Athens and Jerusalem, between the academy and the Church?)<sup>149</sup> Tatian of Syria, writing a generation earlier than Tertullian, proclaimed the Logos doctrine like the other Greek Apologists but was fiercely critical of the whole of Graeco-Roman civilization.<sup>150</sup> It is not without significance, however, that both of these severely negative figures ended their careers as members of extreme ascetic groups separated from Catholic Christianity.

The other school, those expounding the Logos doctrine in a way affirmative and appreciative of certain elements of Hellenistic culture, is represented particularly by Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Origen (c. 185-253-4) was without doubt the most learned scholar-theologian of the early Church. His position of discriminating appreciation of non-Christian culture is expressed in his statement that philosophy "is neither at variance to the law of God at all points, nor in harmony with it in all."<sup>151</sup> The idea of the Logos, as divine Reason and as the teacher of all mankind, is central to the thought of Origen's predecessor at Alexandria, the first known Christian scholar, Clement (c. 150-215).<sup>152</sup>

The classic formulation, however, of the doctrine of the Logos is to be found in Justin Martyr (c. 100-165). The significance of this doctrine is well expressed in the words of A. C. Bouquet, "a doctrine of the Logos was developed as the semi-official way of relating the work and person of Jesus Christ to the larger world of Mediterranean thought and of defining His position in relation to other religious teachers."<sup>153</sup> We shall therefore very briefly give the main lines of Justin's thought on this subject.

Justin taught that although the divine Logos appeared in his fulness only in Jesus Christ, a seed of the Logos was scattered among the whole of mankind long before Christ.<sup>154</sup> Every human being possesses in his reason

a seed (σπέρμα) of the Logos. Thus not only the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament, but also the pagan philosophers bore a germinating seed (λόγος σπερματικός) of the Logos in their souls. Justin by no means approves of paganism as a whole; for him it is full of debased practices and its religion is essentially corrupt. But he teaches that those who lived according to the Logos are Christians, even though they may have been considered atheists by their contemporaries. He cites as examples men such as Socrates, Heraclitus, and others like them among the Greeks.<sup>155</sup> Justin's use of the figure of a seed implanted in the human reason seems at times to connote something like Stoic impersonal immanentism. Perhaps he was not entirely free of this Hellenistic way of thinking. On other occasions, however, he speaks of the Logos more in the discriminating, dynamic and personalistic terms of biblical revelation.

Justin boldly affirms that whatever men in all lands have rightly spoken belongs to us Christians (ὅσα οὐδὲν παρὰ πάντας ἀλλῶς εἴρηται, ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐστὶ). Indeed, all writers, through the seed of the Logos implanted in them, had at least a dim glimpse of the truth.<sup>156</sup> Everything that the philosophers and law-givers discovered and expressed well, they achieved through their discovery and contemplation of some part of the Logos. They did not have a full knowledge of the Logos and hence often contradicted themselves. Socrates was the most zealous of these men, but even he had but a vague knowledge of the Logos. Yet the Logos is in every person.<sup>157</sup>

It is a far cry from this position to the formulation of the Council of Ferrara and Florence which roundly condemned to everlasting fire "all pagans, Jews, heretics and schismatics." We do not have the space to develop here in any detail a thesis of interpretation to account for this great shift.<sup>158</sup> Let us state simply that the development of extreme views of summary and unqualified divine judgments upon the nations or heathen is to a substantial extent a product of cultural isolation. The statement of the Council of Ferrara and Florence can be considered the consequence of a thousand years of geographical and cultural isolation from the rest of mankind. The fact that modern Roman Catholicism was able to develop earlier than Protestant Orthodoxy a more humane, and as we have seen, a more biblically and theologically correct interpretation of the divine mode of dealing with the nations is due, at least in part, to its earlier contacts with and openness to the great non-Christian world. A distinguished example of this more humane view, which is in fact a reinterpretation of the Logos doctrine of the early Church, is the Jesuit Cardinal Juan de Lugo (1583-1660).<sup>159</sup>

This relatively recent development in Roman Catholic teaching is based largely upon the doctrine of natural law, particularly as the latter was formulated by Thomas Aquinas. The origins of the concept of natural law lie in Stoicism as much as in the New Testament. It presupposes the existence of broad principles of human behavior which are based ultimately on the eternal law in the mind of God but may be discerned by the reason of reasonable men everywhere.<sup>160</sup> This is not very different from Paul's views as expounded in Romans 1-3, or from Calvin's.<sup>161</sup> There has been a tendency, however, in Roman Catholic theology, as in Stoicism or modern rationalism, to see this process of discernment as almost exclusively an exercise of human reason and to regard human reason as somehow exempt from either

finiteness or sin or both.<sup>162</sup> We prefer to make, as we have suggested above, the assumption of faith that all authentic knowledge of God or of his will is the result of the revelatory activity of God and hence of a more existential divine-human encounter. This is not to deny to human reason a role in the process, but it would not be in accord with biblical perspective to exempt reason from the experienced contingency and fallibilities of the human situation.

We shall also have to reserve for another occasion a serious attempt to achieve through an application of the Logos principle a theological understanding of the great world religions. The use of the principle of course does not mean the affirmation of a non-Christian religion *per se* either in the person and teachings of its founder or as an historical movement. Indeed, it does not allow unqualified approval, as we have learned from our biblical studies, of Christianity itself, seen as an empirical human movement. A suggestive though brief attempt, however, to effect such a theological understanding has recently been made by the Swiss diplomat-scholar Jacques-Albert Cottat. Cottat sees Heilsgeschichte as being in fact a universal Sacred History and suggests, for instance, certain divine significance in the emergence of the spirit of compassion (*karuṇā*) in Mahāyāna Buddhism in the first centuries of our era. The further development of Amida Buddhism in ninth century China and in eleventh century Japan represents, he feels, the transmutation of a way of ascetic self-discipline without a personal God (primitive Buddhism) into a religion of faith in the personalized "Other" (Amitabha Buddha—Amida Butsu).<sup>163</sup>

Cottat also sees divine significance in the position of the eleventh century Hindu mystic-philosopher Rāmānuja. Rāmānuja gave sophisticated theological expression to the tradition of Bhakti devotion in Hinduism, of which the exuberant love and devotion to a personal deity are difficult to explain in terms of the socially dominant Upanishadic literature and the Vedānta hermeneutical tradition.<sup>169</sup> Cottat regards these two phenomena as bearing monotheistic dimensions, the first of free grace, the second of intimate communion with the personal and transcendent God. He sees the Muslim mystic and martyr Al-Hallāj (d. 922 A. D.) as representing the crucifying aspect of unitive love, at least in part as in the Christian tradition.<sup>165</sup>

But this approach is not merely in order to attain a more correct knowledge for its own sake. Such knowledge or understanding is necessary for the Christian mission to be effective in our day. A Christian Arab scholar has recently expressed the need in these terms, "living Muslims wait with eager ears to hear a genuine word of love for Muhammad from the followers of Christ."<sup>166</sup> That is, the finality of Jesus Christ is not to be understood in terms of mere temporal sequence, as if divine revelation and prophethood had ceased with the ascension of the Christ. Even more, the Lordship of Christ does not mean that his followers must be hostile to other religious teachers. Rather, Christ is final in the sense that he is the supreme revelation of the living God and by him we evaluate all else in heaven and on earth. If the Muslim world waits for a Christ-like graciousness of interpretation of Muhammad, so does the Buddhist world of Gautama or Shinran, the Hindu world of Rāmānuja or Gandhi. Men everywhere crave to know what is the divine meaning of the past of their people, and they will no longer stay with the answer that it has no meaning.

## VIII.

If, then, appreciation of other cultures and religious traditions is possible for a Christian, and if the ultimate destiny of the nations does not hang utterly and precariously upon empirical proclamation of the Gospel by Christian witnesses, what is the *raison d'être* or motive for the Christian world mission? We cannot of course consider this problem to any extent at this time. We shall confine ourselves to a few intimations that can be followed upon another occasion. Perhaps the primary reason for the believing Christian is that he has been commanded by his Lord to "go".<sup>167</sup> But we are also human beings with minds and we want to know the why and wherefore of the things we do. It is good of course that we do so want to know. And there are other reasons that move us to go, to the places that are near or the places that are far. For one thing, the biblical doctrine of God, his nature as one, as active, revealing, sending love, impels us.<sup>168</sup>

But even this central biblical concept of God as active love is not without problems for the contemporary Christian. As we have seen, the concept is properly understood as indicating the presence and work of the Spirit of God in the whole of human history. Paul Tillich's "latent Church" or Karl Rahner's "anonymous Christians" are theological expressions of this insight. Karl Barth's views of the Kingdom of Christ as including all men and of the New Being in Christ as belonging to all men are related concepts. The question remains, however, whether these concepts necessarily constitute an implicit universalism and therefore obviate any need for Christians to "go".

A recent Roman Catholic attempt to wrestle with this dilemma is that of Eugene Hillman, who makes extensive use of the writings of Karl Rahner and E. Schillebeeckx. Hillman sees the missionary activity of the Church as essentially an "eschatological work". Hudson Taylor and other men of the independent Protestant missionary societies also derived the urgency of missions from their function as a necessary means to prepare for and hasten the return of Christ. But in contrast to the excessive individualism and inadequate ecclesiology of the faith missions, Hillman emphasizes the central importance of the presence of the Church as the "sign" of the salvation of the nations. He does not, however, understand this to signify salvation guaranteed for all. He sees the planting of the Church "on firm and indigenous foundations" among all the distinctive ethnic-culture units of mankind to be the work of making Christ "sacramentally present" among them and to constitute the necessary condition for the end of history and the return of the Lord.<sup>169</sup> Hillman represents therefore a contemporary reformulation of the primarily eschatological motive.

In the history of Christian missions compassion for what we may call the present plight of non-Christians has not, in the great majority of cases, been separable from concern for their eternal salvation. Yet this compassion has been responsible especially from the beginning of the nineteenth century for a vast range of life and culture-transforming activities in the areas of education and health services. As a motivation for missions it has undoubtedly often been mixed with un-Christian concepts of Western cultural superiority. Yet the example of Jesus and of the early Church, the lordship of



Christ over time and history make it clear that concern for the present spiritual and physical condition of men is an integral part of the Christian faith. A brief mention, therefore, of what we may call a pragmatic or temporal motivation would seem to be in order.

We suggested above that through the faithful proclamation of the Gospel and the presence of a Christian community God has elected to make available to mankind divine Truth and Power not available in any other way. That is to say, it really makes a difference, often a discernible difference, among individuals and groups in any society if the Gospel be faithfully proclaimed and lived in that society. There are some areas in which this difference is perhaps more readily discernible than in others. Kenneth Scott Latourette endeavored to trace what he called the effect of Christianity upon its environment in each of his great volumes on the history of the expansion of Christianity.<sup>169</sup> He was also concerned, to be sure, to indicate what he thought were influences of its environment upon Christianity. Perhaps, however, a simple illustration will communicate our point.

I once had the opportunity to hear the distinguished General Secretary of the National Y. M. C. A. of Japan, Sōichi Saitō, address a gathering of students in the city of Kamakura. He spoke of course in Japanese; I believe I was the only foreigner present. In this talk Saitō endeavored to list and describe the contributions of the Christian Gospel to Japan, not only to Japanese Christians, but in some measure to all Japanese. It was an impressive list and I wish we had time to discuss it in detail. Beginning with the elevation of the social status of women, an item the importance of which is perhaps not as much appreciated by this as by former generations, Saitō went on to cite the contributions of the idea of monotheism, social and political justice, the concept of personality, a single standard of sexual morality, the transformation of the inner man, his motives and attitudes. He spoke as a man who had seen most of these contributions discernibly in process in his own lifetime. This kind of an eye-witness report, so to speak, can be duplicated from almost every part of Asia or Africa, and the accumulation of them constitutes for thoughtful people a most weighty testimony to the power and significance of the Christian Gospel in human life. This is not to say that we must have visible results to justify or authenticate Christian witness, but in so far as these seem to be given, they deserve our careful consideration.

But we have learned from this study, we trust, not to attempt to corrolate the judgments of God with our human institutional or cultural alignments, nor to prejudge the final destinies of men by our own evaluations of their spiritual knowledge and attainments. John C. Bennett recently gave a very succinct expression to this truth, "We must not surround evangelism with the assumption that Christians have a monopoly on the saving grace of God. We may believe that the revelation of God in Christ is normative, not only for us but for all men, but this is quite different from suggesting that God cannot save those who are outside the Christian circle. Belief in the sure mediation of God's grace through Christ is motive enough to seek a Christian witness and a Christian presence in every community, but to stress the importance of this need not mean to deny that non-Christians are in relation to God and receive grace and truth from him in ways uncharted by Christian theology."<sup>170</sup>

We do not of course wish to presume on the mercy of God. We have been told that there is a lesson to be learned from the two thieves who were crucified together with Jesus. One was saved, it is said, that we may not despair. The other was not that we may not presume. The Gospel also proclaims the grace of God that we may enter the **Kingdom** of God and live by and under his **authority**. But through all Christian witness and service there properly ever moves the spirit expressed in the words of Frederick W. Faber,

“There’s a wideness in God’s mercy,  
Like the wideness of the sea;  
There’s a kindness in His justice,  
Which is more than liberty.

For the love of God is broader  
Than the measure of man’s mind;  
And the heart of the Eternal  
Is most wonderfully kind.”<sup>171</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

## FOOTNOTES

1. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, **No Other Name**, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963, p. 114. Cf. **The Finality of Jesus Christ in the Age of Universal History**, Bulletin, Division of Studies, WCC, Vol. 8, No. 2, Autumn 1962, Lausanne, p. 4-5.
2. Mt. 25.14-30.
3. Mt. 6.26.
4. Mt. 10.31; Lk. 12.7.
5. Mt. 12.12.
6. Lk. 12.6.
7. Mt. 10.29.
8. Mt. 10.30.
9. Mk. 7.27 (Mt. 15.26).
10. E.g. Frederick C. Grant, **The Interpreter's Bible**, New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1951, vol. 7, p. 755. However, cf. H. B. Swete, **The Gospel According to St. Mark**, London: Macmillan and Co., 1927, p. 157-158. Swete continues the apologetic hermeneutical tradition. He quotes, however, the observation of Jerome: "O mira rerum conversio! Israel quondam filius, nos canes."
11. Johannes Blauw, **The Missionary Nature of the Church**, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962, p. 23.
12. Acts 4.12.
13. This view, however, is still proclaimed in certain conservative evangelical circles. For example, an evangelist who has preached widely outside as well as within the United States, T. L. Osborn, writes in the context of the contemporary population explosion: "The world is hurtling to a lost eternity at a frightening rate." Why I Am a Soulwinner, Part 3, **Faith Digest**, vol. II, no. 3, March 1966, p. 9.
14. Stephen Neill, **A History of Christian Missions**, Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1964, p. 333-4.
15. Quoted in Howard Taylor, **Hudson Taylor and the China Inland Mission**, London: China Inland Mission, 1949, p. VII.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 7 (Ps. 9.17—King James version).
18. *Ibid.*, p. 27, 30.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
20. Bradley Smith, **Japan, A History in Art**, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1964, p. 159.
21. H. E. Jacobs, ed., **The Book of Concord**, Philadelphia: General Council Publication Board, 1911, p. 186.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 392, 3, 5. (The First Commandment).
23. John T. McNeill, F. L. Battles, ed., **Institutes of the Christian Religion**, 1, 10, 3. The Library of Christian Classics, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960, vol. 20, p. 99. Certain early Anabaptist and Spiritual writers seem to suggest a less rigid view. Thus Balthasar Hubmaier wrote that "God gives power and capacity to all men in so far as they themselves desire it." "On Free Will" in G. H. Williams, **Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers**, The Library of Christian Classics, vol. 25, Philadel-

- phia: The Westminster Press, 1957, p. 129. Sebastian Franck wrote in his "A Letter to John Campanus," "God is no respecter of persons but instead is to the Greeks as to the barbarian and the Turk, to the lord as to the servant, so long as they retain the light which has shined upon them and gives their heart an eternal glow." *Ibid.*, p. 150.
24. Karl Adam, **The Spirit of Catholicism**, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1962, p. 175. The same position was expressed in the bull **Unam Sanctam** issued in 1302 by Pope Boniface VIII. Henry Bettenson, **Documents of the Christian Church**, New York: Oxford University Press, 1947, p. 161-163.
  25. St. Thomas Aquinas, **Summa Theologica**, Pt. III. Quest. 61, Art. 1, New York: Benziger Brothers Inc., 1947, vol. 2, p. 2352.
  26. Adam. *Op. cit.*, p. 172.
  27. James Brodrick, S. J., **Saint Francis Xavier**, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1957, p. 262. Cf. **Saint Augustine**, J. C. Murray, S. J., trans., Admonition and Grace 7, New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1947, p. 259.
  28. H. J. Margull, the Awakening of Protestant Missions, **History's Lessons for Tomorrow's Missions**, Geneva: WSCF, 1960, p. 144, 142.
  29. A significant exception to this prevailing view is found in George Fox and the Society of Friends. Fox held a position similar to that which we have noted (footnote #23) in certain Anabaptist and Spiritual writers of the Reformation period. He believed that every man receives from the Lord an inner light, which if faithfully followed will lead to a direct and saving knowledge of God. Rufus M. Jones, ed., **The Journal of George Fox**, New York: Capricorn Books, 1963, p. 100-101.
  30. **The Witness**, Dubuque Ia., p. 12a (Nov. 4, 1965). Cf. **The Finality of Jesus Christ in the Age of Universal History**, *Op. cit.*, P. 29-30.
  31. **New Delhi Speaks**, New York: Association Press, 1962, p. 18.
  32. *Ibid.*, p. 27, 29, 30.
  33. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
  34. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
  35. **Report of the Special Committee on a Brief Contemporary Statement of Faith**, Philadelphia: Office of the General Assembly, 1965, p. 37.
  36. George E. Mendenhall has shown that the Israelitic covenant was patterned after those widely in use between suzerains and their vassals in the Middle East of the second millenium B. C. **The Biblical Archaeologist**, vol 17, no. 2 (May 1954), p. 26-46; no. 3 (Sept. 1954), p. 49-76.
  37. G. E. Wright, **The Old Testament Against Its Environment**, Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1950, p. 50.
  38. Cf. Zeph. 3.5.
  39. Is. 1, 23, 27; 4.8; 10.2; 58.6-7; Jer. 2.34; 5.28; Ezek. 7.10-11; 8.17; 9.9; Amos 2.6, 7; 4.1; 5.11-12; 8.4; Mic. 2.2; 3.1-3; 6.12; 7.3; Hab. 2.6, Mal. 3.5.
  40. Is. 5, 11; 57.5; Hos. 4.14.
  41. Joel 2.13.
  42. Jer. 3.8; Ezek. 16.32; Hos. 7.4.

43. 1 Kings 18.20-46.
44. 1 Kings 18.20-21.
45. Amos 3.2; Hos. 4.14.
46. W. F. Albright, **From the Stone Age to Christianity**, Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1940, p. 309.
47. Obad. 15; Nahum 1.2; Zech. 9.1. Johannes Blauw points out that particularly in the historical books of the Old Testament there is a tendency to see the nations as a threat to Israel in politics and a temptation in religion. **Op. cit.**, p. 25.
48. Mal. 1.11, 14; Cf. 1.5, "you shall say, 'Great is the Lord, beyond the border of Israel,'" Cf. Is. 28.11.
49. Hendrik Kraemer, **Religion and the Christian Faith**, London: Lutterworth Press, 1956, p. 242.
50. Is. 41.29. Cf. 44.9-20.
51. Cf. R. C. Dentan, **The Interpreter's Bible**, New York; Abingdon, 1956, vol. 6, p. 1120, 1129.
52. E.g. Jer. 48.46; Is. 33.1; Nah. 3.1.
53. The "ah my brother" of Jer. 22.18 (RSV) and the "alas" of 1 Kings 13.30 are the same word **hoy** elsewhere translated as "woe".
54. G. Ernest Wright, **The Nations in Hebrew Prophecy**, **Encounter**, vol. 26, no. 2 (Spring 1965), p. 231-257.
55. **Ibid.**; cf. Mal. 1.4; Amos 1.3, 6, 9, 11, 13; 2.1; Obad. 3, 10, 13, 14; Nah. 3.1-4.
56. Mal. 3.18.
57. Jer. 7.3-4; Zech. 7.8-9. Note must be taken, however, of the existence also of passages which seem to reflect a narrow nationalism. Thus in Ezek. 28.10; 31.18; 32.32 the death of the uncircumcised is seen as a particularly loathsome kind of death, like those slain by the sword.
58. Zeph. 1.3, 9, 18; Zech. 1.15.
59. Amos 3.2; Hos. 13.4.
60. Amos 3.2; cf. Jer. 7.30-34; Hos. 7.12; Mic. 3.1-4; Mal. 2.8-9.
61. Gen. 1.27; 2.7; Ex. 19.5.
62. Kraemer, **Op. cit.**, p. 253. Cf. Gen. 9.16.
63. Gen. 12.1-3.
64. Amos 9.7.
65. Is. 45.1, 3, 4; cf. 41.25. Cf. Is. 28.11.
66. Is. 45.5.
67. Hab. 1.5, 6, 12.
68. Jer. 25.9.
69. C. F. Fritsch, **The Interpreter's Bible**, **Op. cit.**, vol. 4, p. 947.
70. **Ibid.**, p. 767.
71. Blauw, **Op. cit.**, p. 17. Cf. Is. 42.1-7.
72. **Ibid.**, p. 63.
73. Jonah 4.11.
74. Jonah 3.8.
75. H. H. Rowley, **The Biblical Doctrine of Election**, 3rd ed., 1953, p. 52. Quoted in Blauw, **Op. cit.**, p. 22.
76. Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament, p. 32. Quoted in Blauw, **Op. cit.**, p. 22-23.
77. 1 Cor. 9.27.

78. **Op. cit.**, p. 65.
79. **Ibid.**, p. 73.
80. A. C. Cochrane, The Confession of 1967 and Ecumenicity, **The Presbyterian Outlook**, vol. 147, no. 44 (Dec. 6, 1965), p. 5.
81. Mk. 12.1-9; Mt. 21.33-46; Lk. 20.9-19.
82. The authenticity of this parable was denied by Jülicher and his followers, but C. H. Dodd strongly disagrees, seeing the story in its main lines to be natural and realistic in every way. **The Parables of the Kingdom**, London: Nisbet and Co., 1950, p. 124-132.
83. Cf. H. H. Farmer, **Revelation and Reason**, London: Nisbet and Co., 1961, p. 34 ff.
84. Lk. 4.26.
85. Lk. 4.27.
86. Acts 8.27; 16.14; 18.7.
87. Mt. 8.5-13; Lk. 7.1-10. Cf. Jn. 4.46-53, where βασιλικός could denote a centurion in Herod's service.
88. Mt. 8.11-12.
89. Lk. 12.47-48. Mt. 24.45-51a records the same parable but without this addition.
90. H. J. Cadbury, **Jesus: What Manner of Man**, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947, p. 23.
91. The Greek text for "guilt" is ἁμαρτία. The RSV rendition therefore represents an interpretation signifying "responsibility for sin". Cf. Jn 15.22-24.
92. Mt. 25.32.
93. Mt. 19.30; 20.16; Mk. 10.31; Lk. 13.30.
94. Mt. 6.7, cf. Jn. 4.22.
95. Mt. 6.32; Lk. 12.30.
96. Mk. 10.33; Lk. 21.24. In Acts 4.27 the people of Israel are also included among those who brutally murder the Messiah.
97. Lk. 9.51-56. Cf. C. J. Bleeker, **Christ in Modern Athens**, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965, p. 12.
98. Lk. 12.48.
99. Mt. 13.12.
100. Cadbury, **Op. cit.**, p. 25.
101. Mk. 12.41-44; Lk. 21.1-4.
102. Lk. 7.36-50; Mt. 26.6-13; Mk. 14.3-9.
103. Lk. 10.29-37.
104. Lk. 13.28-29; Mt. 8.11-12.
105. Mt. 5.20.
106. Mt. 10.15; 11.21, 23.
107. Cadbury, **Op. cit.**, p. 26-30.
108. Alan Richardson, ed., **A Theological Word Book of the Bible**, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960, p. 220. Cf. G. Friedrich, **Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament**, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, Band 7, Doppel Lieferung 15-16, p. 989 ff.
109. Cf. Acts 10.4.
110. Acts 17.26-27.
111. Acts 17.28.
112. Cf. Bleeker, **Op. cit.** p. 23-24, 54.

113. Acts 17.23.
114. Heinz-Dietrich Wendland, **Das Neue Testament Deutsch 7**, Die Briefe an die Korinther, Göttingen: Verlag von Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1948, p. 50.
115. Jean Héring understands Paul's use of *ἄγγιλοι* to refer to the angels of the nations concealed behind political powers. Paul's recognition of the divinely instituted role of the "authorities" ( *ἐξουσίαι* ) in Rom. 13.1 would then imply a certain positive significance to this category of *ἄγγιλοι* . Cf. Jean Héring, **The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians**, London: The Epworth Press, 1962, p. 69.
116. Rom. 1.19.
117. Rom. 2.15.
118. Rom. 2.17-18.
119. Rom. 2.25
120. Rom. 2.11.
121. Rom. 2.6.
122. Rom. 2.9-10.
123. Rom. 3.1, 2, 19.
124. Rom. 3.29.
125. Eph. 2.12.
126. Cf. A. C. Bouquet, **The Christian Faith and Non-Christian Religions**, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958, p. 138 ff. Bouquet's book is primarily intended to offer a contemporary interpretation of the problem on the basis of the Logos doctrine.
127. Jn. 1.14.
128. Jn. 1.17.
129. A. Th. van Leeuwen, **Christianity in World History**, London: Edinburgh House Press, 1965, p. 47.
130. Jn. 1.9. Cf. 1.4; 1.16.
131. R. Bultmann, **Theology of the New Testament**, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955, vol. 2, p. 146.
132. **Ibid.**, p. 64.
133. Jn. 1.3. Cf. Bouquet, **Op. cit.**, p. 165.
134. **Op. cit.**, vol. 2, p. 15.
135. Jn. 3.19; 7.7.
136. Jn. 7.24.
137. Jn. 1.10-11; 3.16.
138. Jn. 5:38-42; 8.23-24.
139. Jn. 1.9. According, however, to Jn. 4.22 the nations do not "know" what they worship (cf. Acts 17.23). But in Jn. 8.55 Jesus is recorded as saying to the Jews, "But you have not known him."
140. Jn. 4.21, 23.
141. Jn. 9.39.
142. Mt. 16.19 (18.18-19) must be interpreted in connection with Mt. 7.1; Jn. 5.22; 2 Cor. 5.10; 1 Pet. 4.5.
143. John Foster, **After the Apostles**, London: S C M Press, 1951, p. 47-71.
144. Lactantius, De Ira Dei 2, J.-P. Migne, **Patrologiae Cursus Completus**, Paris: Vrayet, 1844, vol. 7, p. 82.
145. Origen, Contra Celsum 3.15, Migne, **Op. cit.**, 1857, vol. 11, p. 940.

146. K. Heussi, **Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte**. Tübingen, J. C. M. Mohr, 1960, 12th ed., p. 117, Cf. A. E. R. Boak, **A History of Rome to 565 A.D.**, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935, p. 317.
147. 1 Cor. 1.18-2.16. The problem here stated is intended to be distinguished from the special area of relations with the Roman state and worship of the emperor. Both problems are treated in C. N. Cochran, **Christianity and Classical Culture**, New York: Oxford University Press, 1944.
148. Foster, **Op. cit.**, p. 100.
149. Tertullian, De Praescriptione Haereticorum 7.9, **Corpus Christianorum**, Series Latina, Turnhout (Belgium): Brepols, 1964, pars. 1, p. 193.
150. F. L. Cross, **The Early Christian Fathers**, London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1960, p. 53.
151. Quoted in Foster, **Op. cit.**, p. 102.
152. J. Quasten, **Patrology**, Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1953, vol. 2, p. 22-23. Cf. Clement, **Stromata** 1.5.
153. Bouquet, **Op. cit.**, p. 138.
154. Quasten, **Op. cit.**, vol. 1, p. 209.
155. T. B. Falls, **Saint Justin Martyr**, The First Apology, 46, New York: Christian Heritage, 1948, p. 83.
156. **Ibid.**, The Second Apology, 13, p. 133-34; Migne, **Op. cit.**, vol. 6, p. 465-467.
157. **Ibid.**, The Second Apology, 10, p. 129-30.
158. We note a certain ambivalence in Augustine. He can assert that unbaptized babies go to hell (cf. footnote #27) but also writes, "If those who are called philosophers, especially the Platonists, have said things which are by some chance true and conformable to our faith (si qua forte vera et fidei nostrae accommodata), they should not be feared. Rather they should even be claimed for our use as if from unjust possessors." Augustinus, De Doctrina Christiana, II XL, 60 **Corpus Christianorum**, Series Latina, XXXII, Turnhout (Belgium): Brepols, 1962, p. 73.
159. Karl Adam, **Op. cit.**, p. 178.
160. H. Richard Niebuhr, **Christ and Culture**, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956, p. 135.
161. John Calvin, **Institutes of the Christian Religion**, 1, 3, 1. **Op. cit.**, vol. 20, p. 43-44.
162. Reinhold Niebuhr, **The Nature and Destiny of Man**, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949, vol. 1, p. 284.
163. J. A. Cottat, **The Encounter of Religions**, Tournai (Belgium): Desclée Company, 1960, p. 41-42.
164. **Ibid.**, p. 42-45.
165. **Ibid.** p. 46.
166. Daud Rahbar, Muslims and the Finality of Jesus Christ in the Age of Universal History, **The Ecumenical Review**, vol. 17, no. 4 (October 1965), p. 364.
167. Mt. 28.16-20. It is worthy of note that Karl Barth considers this passage to be an authentic account. G. H. Anderson, ed., **The Theology of the Christian Mission**, Karl Barth, An Exegetical Study of Matthew 28:16-20, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961, p. 56-57.



168. Blauw, **Op. cit.**, p. 130.
169. Eugene Hillman, **The Church as Mission**, New York: Herder and Herder, 1965, p. 38, 51.
170. K. S. Latourette, **The First Five Centuries**, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937, p. 239-297. Cf. also vols. 2-7. Cf. Gerhard Uhlhorn, **Die Christliche Liebesthätigkeit in der alten Kirche**, Stuttgart: 1882.
171. J. C. Bennett, The Future of Evangelism, **Christianity Today**, vol. 10, no. 7, (January 7, 1966) p. 45. Copyright 1966 by **Christianity Today**, used by permission.
172. F. W. Faber, 1854. In **The Hymnal**, Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1949, no. 93.

Author - Gift - A.W.

## Program

President Gaylord M. Couchman, Presiding

Professor George B. Ehlhardt, University Marshal

PRELUDE: "Veni creator Spiritus" *Nicolas de Grigny*

en taille à 5

Fugue à 5

à duo

Récit de Cromorne

Dialogue sur les Grand Jeux

PROCESSIONAL HYMN

INVOCATION

THE HOLY SCRIPTURE: Luke 12:42-48 Professor Donald G. Bloesch

PRESENTATION OF PROFESSOR DRUMMOND

FOR INSTALLATION

Professor Arthur C. Cochrane

The Reverend Richard H. Drummond, Professor of Ecumenical Mission and History of Religions. A. B., University of California, Los Angeles; A. M., University of California, Los Angeles; B. D., Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa; Ph. D., University of Wisconsin.

THE DECLARATION OF  
ELECTION AND CONFIRMATION

Dr. David B. Cassat  
Chairman, Board of Directors  
University of Dubuque

THE QUESTIONS

President Couchman

THE INSTALLATION PRAYER

Professor Joseph L. Mihelic

THE CHARGE TO THE PROFESSOR

Dean Calvin Schnucker

THE DECLARATION OF INSTALLATION

The President

INSTALLATION ADDRESS

Professor Drummond

"Prolegomena to a Theology of the Christian World Mission"

BENEDICTION

RECESSIONAL: "Grand Choeur dialogué"

*Eugène Gigout*

Mr. Charles R. McAnall, Organist



